A firewall method for protecting a network element from unauthorized access over a network to which the network element is attached, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming access request;

assigning a proxy agent to the incoming access request in accordance with a port number indicated in the incoming access request;

verifying the authority of the incoming access request to access the protected network element;

verifying that a time period during which an incoming access request is received is valid; and

forming a connection to the network element via the proxy agent on behalf of the incoming access request if the authority and time period of the incoming access request is verified.

In the Abstract:

In line 2, delete "Methods and apparatus are disclosed for providing" and insert -- Providing--.

In the Specification:

On page 3, line 19, insert --to-- between "attempt" and "to";

page 13, line 18, delete reference numeral "310" and insert reference numeral --330--;

page 21, line 8, delete the second occurrence of "to", such that the sentence reads, "...may be able to access the files...".

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 2-5, 7, 10, 11, 13-18, 20-22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31-41, and 47-51 are pending in the application. Claims 47-51 are new claims and are in independent format. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

28)

PID

The Examiner indicated that claims 12 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in

independent format (including all limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims). New

Claim 47 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of claims 12 and 1. New claim

48 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of claims 19 and 1. Applicants submit

that Claims 47 and 48 are therefore in condition for allowance.

The Examiner indicated that claims 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the

rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all

intervening claims. New claim 49 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of

claims 9, 8, 6, and 1. Applicants have corrected the § 112 rejection by modifying the original

claim structure to indicate that the second password is communicated to the user "using a

communication channel other than the network connection". Support for this claim element may

be found on page 20, lines 8-10: "Such a system involves communicating a password, or

password portion, back to a user on a communication medium other than the computer network

being used." Thus, the amendment does not represent new matter. Claims 10 and 11 have been

amended to provide the proper dependency on new claim 49. Applicants submit that Claims 49,

10, and 11 are therefore in condition for allowance.

The Examiner indicated that claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the

rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all

intervening claims. New claim 50 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of

claims 26 and 23. Applicants have corrected the § 112 rejection by modifying the original claim

structure by omitting the "means" language. Applicants submit that Claim 50 is in condition for

allowance.

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff 300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3200 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone (312) 913-0001 The Examiner also indicated that claims 30-33 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. New claim 51 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of claims 30, 27, and 23. Applicants have corrected the § 112 rejection by modifying the original claim structure to indicate that the second password is communicated to the user "using a communication channel other than the network connection". As stated above, support for this claim element may be found on page 20, lines 8-10. Thus, the amendment does not represent new matter. Claims 31 and 32 have been amended to provide the proper dependency on new claim 51. New claim 52 is an independent claim that includes all the limitations of claims 33 and 23. Applicants submit that Claims 51, 52, 31 and 32 are therefore in condition for allowance.

All of the remaining dependent claims (2-5, 7, 13-18, 20-22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 34-41), have been amended to provide the proper dependency. Claims 15, 36 and 39 have been amended to correct the claim objections, and claims 4, 10, 11, 30, and 32 have been amended to correct the § 112 rejections. Thus Applicants submit that those claims are also in condition for allowance.

The specification has been amended to address the Examiner's objections to non-idiomatic english, and to correct the institutional user's reference numeral to be 330, not 310. This also resolves the Examiner's objection to the non-use of the reference numeral 330 in FIG. 3.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the claims, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicants submit that the drawings show the claim elements to the extent required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), and that further functional language or description detail of particularly claimed features included in the claims may be found within the

specification. Examples from the specification of the description of the claimed features of the firewall are set forth below, the format corresponding to each of the Examiner's comments:

i) the firewall box is indicated in FIG. 2 as element 210, and FIG. 3 as element 318, ii) page 9, lines 14-15; page 11, lines 16-17; page 14, lines 6-8, iii) page 9, lines 15-17; page 11, lines 23-25; page 14, lines 6-8, iv) page 14, line 6, v) page 14, lines 11-17, vi) page 20, lines 6-19, vii) page 20, lines 18-19, viii) page 20, lines 18-19, ix) page 16, lines 20-22, x) page 21, lines 17-18, xi) page 20, lines 20-22, xii) page 21, lines 4-6, xiii) page 17, lines 9-17, xiv) page 17, lines 9-17, xv) page 21, lines 23-26, xvi) page 12, lines 8-11; page 14, lines 11-14, xvii) page 17, lines 3-5, xviii) page 12, lines 3-14, xix) page 14, lines 22-29; page 18, lines 15-17, xx) page 20, lines 6-19, xxi) page 20, lines 18-19, xxii) page 20, lines 12-15, xxiii) page 16, lines 20-22, xxiv) page 21, lines 17-18, xxv) page 20, lines 20-22, xxvi) page 21, lines 4-6, xxvii) page 17, lines 9-17, xxviii) page 21, lines 23-26. The remaining drawing objections (xxix to xxxv) relate to claims that have been cancelled by the present amendment. Applicant nonetheless submits that those elements are fully described within the specification, and need not be added to the drawings.

The Examiner has requested that Applicants provide suitable descriptive legends to FIG.

3. Applicants therefore submit herewith a Submission of Proposed Drawing Correction.

Finally, Applicants have provided the Examiner with additional prior art references for consideration, and have submitted the appropriate fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(c).

Conclusion

Applicant has amended claims for the purpose of clarification, in accordance with the Examiner's comments. If the Examiner feels that further dialog would be helpful in moving this case toward issuance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF

Marthew J. Sampson

Registration No. 35999